



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,290	10/22/2003	Scott Douglas Frei	ROC920030290US1	2244

7590 05/24/2007
Grant A. Johnson
IBM Corporation
Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

OSBERG, THUY THANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/24/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,290

Applicant(s)

FREI ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy Osberg

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to amendment filed 05/01/2007 to the original application filed 10/22/2003. **This action is made Final.**
 - A. Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.
 - B. Claims 15-22 have been withdrawn.
 - C. Claims 1 and 9 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashe (US Patent 5,995,103) in view of Lee (US Patent 6,191,758).**

The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representation of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. The Applicant should consider the entire prior art as applicable as to the limitations of the claims. It is respectfully requested from the Applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the Examiner.

Art Unit: 2179

As claim 1, Ashe teaches a method comprising:
presenting a plurality of windows on an output device (fig. 2, labels 235, 242; col. 6, lines 27-37);
selecting a subset of the plurality of windows (col. 14, lines 60-67 and col. 15, lines 1-6);
and sending the subset to an auxiliary output device (fig.2, label 232; col. 6, lines 35-48, that monitor 232 is a output device).

Ashe does not teach the auxiliary output device is separate from the output device.

However, Lee teaches the auxiliary output device is separate from the output device (fig. 4, labels S42, S44, S46; col. 5, lines 44-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art the time the invention to modify Ashe by having the auxiliary output device is separate from the output device as taught by Lee in order to provide a larger and enhanced work area by selectively displaying selected applications/windows on the secondary display (Lee: col. 1, lines 34-37).

As claim 3, Ashe further teaches selecting the subset based on group affiliations of the plurality of windows (col. 14, lines 60-67; col. 15, lines 1-6).

As claim 4 Ashe further teaches selecting the subset based on a list of allowed applications (fig. 7, label 710, 726; col. 15, lines 58-62).

As claim 5, Ashe further teaches selecting the subset based on a list of disallowed applications (col. 16, lines 26-40, that by marking the window element as "private" and not coping it to the buffer is disallowing the windows element to be displayed).

As claim 6, Ashe further teaches the selecting further comprises:

detecting that an application has launched (col. 5, lines 62-67; col. 6, lines 1-4);
and determining whether the application belongs to a group (col. 3, lines 55-67; col. 4, lines 1-4).

As claim 7, Ashe further teaches the selecting further comprises:

detecting that an application has been brought into focus (col. 2, lines 18-24);
and determining whether the application belongs to a group (col. 3, lines 55-67; col. 4, lines 1-4).

As claim 8, Ashe further teaches changing the subset that is sent to the auxiliary output device (col. 15, lines 15-21).

As claim 9, Ashe teaches an apparatus comprising:

means for presenting a plurality of windows on an output device (col. 6, lines 27-37);
means for selecting a subset of the plurality of windows (col. 14, lines 60-67 and col. 15, lines 1-6);
means for sending the subset to an auxiliary output device (col. 6, lines 35-48).
and means for refraining from sending windows not in the subset to the auxiliary output device (col. 16, lines 26-40, that by marking the window element as "private" and not coping it to the buffer is refraining the windows element from being displayed).

Ashe does not teach the auxiliary output device is separate from the output device.

However, Lee teaches the auxiliary output device is separate from the output device (fig. 4, labels S42, S44, S46; col. 5, lines 44-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 2179

ordinary skill in the art the time the invention to modify Ashe by having the auxiliary output device is separate from the output device as taught by Lee in order to provide a larger and enhanced work area by selectively displaying selected applications/windows on the secondary display (Lee: col. 1, lines 34-37).

As claim 11 Ashe further teaches the means for selecting the subset based on group affiliations of the plurality of windows (col. 14, lines 60-67; col. 15, lines 1-6).

As claim 12, Ashe further teaches means for displaying the group affiliations in the respective windows (col. 1, lines 66-67; col. 2, lines 1-17).

As claim 13, Ashe further teaches the means for selecting further comprises:
means for detecting that an application has launched (col. 5, lines 62-67; col. 6, lines 1-4);
and means for determining whether the application belongs to a group (col. 3, lines 55-67; col. 4, lines 1-4).

As claim 14, Ashe further teaches selecting further comprises:
means for detecting that an application has been brought into focus (col. 2, lines 18-24);
and means for determining whether the application belongs to a hidden group (col. 16, lines 26-40, that by marking the window element as "private" and not coping it to the buffer is hiding the windows element and not allowing the to be displayed).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 5. Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashe and Lee in view of Kohno (US Patent 6,396,514).**

As claims 2 and 10, Ashe and Lee do not teach auxiliary output device comprises a projector.

However, Kohno teaches teach auxiliary output device comprises a projector (fig. 2, label 5a; col. 4, lines 45-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art the time the invention to modify Ashe by having the auxiliary output device comprises a projector as taught by Kohno in order to provide an enhanced visual display for an audience (col. 1, lines 47-52).

Response to Arguments

- 6. Applicant's arguments filed 05/01/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejections to claims 1-14 are maintained.**

a. **Applicant argues that** Ahse teaches that Fig. 2, only illustrates one monitor 232 with one display screen 235, on which all windows 242 are displayed. Ashe's environment display screen on which all windows are displayed is further reinforced by Figs. 6A and 6B and column 8, lines 58-61, which describes the Ashe windows as having a "z-ordering" with respect to one another.

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. The Examiner submits that to combine the further teachings of Lee to selectively display items/windows on an auxiliary output device, which is separate from the output device (fig. 4, labels S42, S44, S46; col. 5, lines 44-46).

b. **Applicant argues that** Ashe and Kohno do not teach or suggest "presenting a plurality of windows on an output device; selecting a subset of the plurality of windows; and sending the subset to an auxiliary output device, wherein the auxiliary output device is separate from the output device"

In response, Examiner respectfully submits and is not persuaded. The Examiner submits not only does Ashe and Kohno teach "presenting a plurality of windows on an output device; selecting a subset of the plurality of windows; and sending the subset to an auxiliary output device, wherein the auxiliary output device is separate from the output device", but to further combine the teaching of Lee (fig. 4, labels S42, S44, S46; col. 5, lines 44-46) it is explicitly taught that selecting a subset of windows and sending them to an auxiliary output device that is separate from the other auxiliary output device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ashe, Lee and Kohno. Therefore, claims 1- 14 are not allowable over Ashe, Lee and Kohno.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Osberg whose telephone number is 571-270-1258. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30AM-5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2179

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TTO

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER